

**REMARKS**

Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, and 14 as set forth above. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested.

The Office has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,468,164 to Demissy (Demissy), claims 1 - 5, 8 - 11 and 14 - 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 4,076,369 to Ostapovitch (Ostapovitch), claims 6, 12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over in view of US Patent No 5,554,056 to Henricus op ten Berg (Henricus op ten Berg), and claims 7, 13 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostapovitch in view of France Patent No. 2 512 283 to Borne et al. (Borne). The Office asserts that Demissy discloses an electrical socket contact 1 for mating with a pin contact 8 with: an electrically conductive body 11-13 having a pin contact engaging bore 13: at least two pin contact arc receiving elements 3 (see Fig. 1) which extend in to the bore 13, wherein the arc receiving elements 3 are spaced apart across the bore 13 a distance that is greater than a maximum transverse dimension of the pin contact; and a plurality of spring contacts 11 spaced in and laterally offset from the arc receiving elements 3 along the bore (see Fig. 4). The Office asserts that Ostapovitch discloses an electrical socket contact 10 (Fig. 4-6) and a method of making/mating the socket contact with a pin contact (indicated in a full outline 20, Fig. 6) with: an electrically conductive body 11 having a pin contact engaging bore: two guide portions 28, 28 which are pin contact arc-shaped receiving elements extending into the bore, wherein the arc-shaped receiving elements are spaced apart across the bore and having a distance that is greater than a maximum transverse dimension of the pin contact (Figs. 4 and 6); and a plurality of spring contacts 25, 27 spaced in and laterally offset from the arc-shaped receiving elements along the bore. The Office acknowledges that Ostapovitch does not disclose a latch spaced in from the spring contacts along the bore, but asserts that Henricus op ten Berg discloses a socket contact 2 (Fig. 1) comprises a latch 16 spaced in from spring contacts 30 along a bore defined between the spring contacts. The Office also acknowledges that Ostapovitch does not disclose the arc receiving elements are fixed, non-cantilevered, arc receiving elements, but asserts that Borne discloses a socket contact 14 (Fig. 6) comprises a closed loop, front body section having a plurality of bosses 26 (Fig. 1) which are fixed, non-cantilevered, arc receiving elements.

Demissy does not disclose or suggest, “wherein the arc receiving elements are spaced apart across the bore a distance that is greater than a maximum transverse dimension of the pin contact” as recited in claim 1. The Office’s attention is respectfully directed to FIG. 2 and to col. 3, lines 9-11 in Demissy which clearly illustrates and discloses that a distance across the pellets 3 is less than a maximum transverse dimension across the male contact 8. As disclosed at col. 3, lines 35-41 in Demissy a spring 15 is disposed around the insulating fingers 3 with the pellets 3 which further helps to ensure that a distance across the pellets 3 is less than a maximum transverse dimension across the male contact 8. Accordingly, in view of the foregoing remarks, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1 based on Demissy.

Additionally, Ostapovitch, Demissy, Henricus op ten Berg, and Borne, alone or in combination do not disclose or suggest, “a plurality of conductive spring contacts spaced in from and not aligned with the arc receiving elements in a direction along the first axis of the bore and which extend in towards the first axis” as recited in claim 1, “providing a plurality of conductive spring contacts in the body which extend into the bore, the conductive spring contacts are spaced in from and not aligned with the pin contact arc receiving elements in a direction along the first axis of the bore and extend in towards the first axis” as recited in claim 8, or “contacting at least one conductive spring contact in the bore in the body with the pin contact, the conductive spring contact is spaced in from and not aligned with the pin contact arc receiving element in a direction along the first axis of the axial bore and which extends in towards the first axis” as recited in claim 14.

The Office’s attention is respectfully directed to FIGS. 4 and 12 and to col. 2, lines 43-48 in Ostapovitch which illustrate and disclose that the beams 25 and remaining portions 28 are formed from the same portion of the surface of the box portion 11 and thus are in alignment with each other along the axis which extends along the box terminal. Since the remaining portions 28 with the domed contact areas 27 are adjacent and in alignment with the beams 25 in Ostapovitch, as a pin terminal is inserted into the box portion 11 this alignment may result in a damaging arc between the pin contact and the domed contact areas 27. Additionally, the Office’s attention is respectfully directed to col. 2, lines 44-47, line 54, and lines 64-65 and col. 3, lines 5-6 and 41 in Demissy which disclose that the fingers 11 are made of an insulating material and thus are not conductive spring contacts as claimed. Like


Ostapovitch and Demissy, neither Henricus nor Borne teach or suggest the invention as claimed.

With the present invention, the offset alignment of the arc receiving elements and the conductive spring contacts in a direction along an axis of the bore helps to prevent arc damage to the conductive spring contacts suffered by the arc receiving elements as described in the first paragraph on page 3 of the above-identified patent application. Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 8, and 14. Since claims 2-7 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 1, claims 9-13 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 8, and claims 15-17 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 14, they are distinguishable over the cited references and patentable in the same manner as claims 1, 8, and 14.

In view of all of the foregoing, applicant submits that this case is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 4, 2005

  
Gunnar G. Leinberg  
Registration No. 35,584

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
Clinton Square, P.O. Box 31051  
Rochester, New York 14603-1051  
Telephone: (585) 263-1014  
Facsimile: (585) 263-1600

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

- ☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
- ☐ transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (703) \_\_\_\_\_.

April 4, 2005

Date



Signature

Sherri A. Moscato  
Type or Print Name